UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/534,800	12/02/2005	Atsushi Muraguchi	2870-0299PUS1	1644	
	7590 03/26/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER			
PO BOX 747		YU, MELANIE J			
FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1641			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/26/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary			Application No.		Applicant(s)				
			10/534,800		MURAGUCHI ET AL.				
		E	xaminer		Art Unit				
		N	MELANIE YU		1641				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commur r Reply	nication appea	rs on the cover she	et with the co	rrespondence ac	idress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE N Isions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply is specified above, the maximum single to reply within the set or extended period for reply eply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DAT s of 37 CFR 1.136(a munication. tatutory period will a y will, by statute, ca	E OF THIS COMM a). In no event, however, m apply and will expire SIX (6) use the application to become	UNICATION. nay a reply be time MONTHS from the me ABANDONED	ely filed ne mailing date of this c (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>12 May</i>	2005						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12 May 2005</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)		<i>7</i> —		matters, pros	secution as to the	e merits is			
٠,١	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims		•						
· ·		annlication							
	Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
•	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
	6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.								
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		-ti						
8)[2]	Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> are subject to restricti	ion and/or ele	ction requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers								
9)	The specification is objected to by th	ne Examiner.							
10)	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority ເ	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some color None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 									
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (I nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	PTO-948)	Papel 5) Notic	view Summary (F er No(s)/Mail Date ee of Informal Pat r:	e				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-8 are drawn to a microwell array chip comprising the special technical feature of containing a single lymphocyte.

Group II, claim(s) 9-16 are drawn to a method comprising the special technical feature of adding antigen to each microwell.

Group III, claim(s) 17-26 are drawn to a method comprising the special technical feature of an antigen specific antigen receptor gene cloned from the single antigen specific lymphocyte.

Group IV, claim(s) 27 is drawn to a method of manufacturing a monoclonal antibody.

Group V, claim(s) 28 is drawn to a method of manufacturing material for gene therapy.

1. The inventions listed as Groups I-V do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: groups IV and V are drawn to methods that do not share a special technical relationship. Furthermore, the application contains method and product claims to more than one of the combinations of inventions as set forth by 37 CFR 1.475.

According to 37 CFR 1.475 regarding unity of invention:

(a) An international and a national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention"). Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical

Art Unit: 1641

features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

- (b) An international or a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:
- (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
- (2) A product and a process of use of said product; or
- (3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or
- (4) A process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or
- (5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.

Unity of invention exists only when there is a technical relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more special technical features. The term "special technical features" is defined as meaning those technical features that define a contribution with each of the inventions considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. The determination is made based on the contents of the claims as interpreted in light of the description and drawings.

Applicants are allowed at most one product, one method of making and one method of using in a single general inventive concept. However, the product, method of using and method of making of groups I-V do not form a general inventive concept because they do not share a special technical feature over the prior art. Weinreb et al. teach a microwell array chip that has multiple microwells (cell receiving holes, col. 2, lines 61-64) and is employed to contain a single lymphocyte specimen in each microwell and only one lymphocyte is contained in each microwell (col. 2, line 64-col. 3, line 6; cells are lymphocytes, col. 6, lines 31-44).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

- 2. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the

product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic. If group I is elected, ONE species from species listed in group A must also be elected.

Group A is drawn to a microwell shape selected from: cylindrical, rectangular parallelepiped, inverse conical and inverse pyramid.

Each of the shapes of group A are patentably distinct because they are structurally different and cannot coexist.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Art Unit: 1641

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To

reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the

election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MELANIE YU whose telephone number is (571)272-2933.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Long Le can be reached on (571) 272-0823. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-

217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA

OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melanie Yu/

Examiner, Art Unit 1641

/Long V Le/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1641